

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 29 were submitted for examination. In this Office Action, Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-13 and 16 are allowed, claims 4, 11, 14-15, and 17-22 are rejected under 35 USC 112, and claims 23-29 are rejected under 35 USC(a) as being unpatentable over Sander et al (US Pat. App. Pub. No.: 20040208157, hereinafter “Sander”) in view of Minoda et al (US Pat. No.: 5,661,425, hereinafter “Minoda”).

The Examiner is appreciated for the thoughtful examination and comments in the Office Action. In the foregoing amendments, the Applicant has amended the specification to clarify the question raised by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action, and Claims 4, 11, 14-15, and 17-22 to correct the informalities raised by the Examiner. The Applicant submits that no new matters have been added. Accordingly, the Applicant believes that the rejections under 35 USC 112 have been overcome. Claims 1-22 shall be now in condition for allowance.

Patentability of Claim 23:

Claims 23-29 are still rejected. Claim 23 has been amended to include a limitation shown in FIG. 5. It is axiomatic that an invention in a patent application is defined by, and must be examined with respect to, the specific language of the claims. As amended, Claim 23 now recites:

compensating a frequency drift and other non-linear effects of a modulated voltage-controlled-oscillator (VCO) and a power amplifier by predistorting a baseband amplitude signal and a phase signal in accordance with one or more distorting parameters that are determined based on a sample of an output of the transmitter, wherein the baseband amplitude signal and the phase signal have been decomposed in terms of polar coordinates; providing a phase-locked loop (PLL) with an adaptive phase gain and a phase offset control in response to the phase signal; and modulating the power amplifier with the baseband amplitude signal and an output coupled from the modulated voltage controlled oscillator (VCO).

(*emphasis added*)

FIG. 5 of the instant application clearly shows that a sample of the output of the transmitter is taken and goes through a down-conversion unit 537 and a demodulation 535 to determine the predistortion calibration. In other words, there is a feedback loop including the output of the transmitter.

In contrast, Sander shows in FIG. 12 that no sample of the output is taken to control the “pre-distortion” of the signals. In other words, Sander fails to teach nor suggest a feedback loop including the output of the transmitter, neither does Minoda teach such, viewed alone or in combination. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits Claim 23 shall be allowable over the cited references. Reconsideration of Claims 23-29 is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that Claims 1 - 29 shall be in condition for allowance over the cited references. Early and favorable action is being respectfully solicited.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplementary Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (408)777-8873.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, DC 20231", on June 18, 2007.

e-filed

Signature: / joe zheng /
Joe Zheng

Respectfully submitted;

/ joe zheng /

Joe Zheng
Reg. No.: 39,450